

MILITARY PERSONAL PROPERTY AND CLAIMS SYMPOSIUM

18 September 2002

Holiday Inn Hotel and Suites
625 First Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Military Chairperson

Col Silvia Signars Anderson

Industry Chairperson

Mr. Steve Hollingsworth

AGENDA SUMMARY

0830 hours - 0840 hours	Opening Comments
0840 hours - 1200 hours	Topics
1200 hours - 1300 hours	Lunch Break
1300 hours - 1500 hours	Topics

OLD BUSINESS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
122	619 Forms and the DTR	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
123	New 619	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command and Personal Property Systems Team
149	Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) - Part IV	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
150	Updates to DTR - Part IV	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
177	Review of Transit Guide (Transit Times)	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
179	All Codes – Overtime Loading and Delivery Charges	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
180	Special Solicitations – Bidding/Award Process	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team and Personal Property Systems Team

OLD BUSINESS (continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPOSERS</u>
189	Transit Times – Code 4 Shipments - Korea to Hawaii	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
193	Getting Paid for NTS	American Moving and Storage Association Defense Finance and Accounting Service
202	Defense Transportation Regulation - Part IV	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
203	Electronic Transmission of Documents	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team and Military Services
205	Baggage Pick Up or Delivery from SIT	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
211	TDR – Class 2 Rates - Low Volume Areas	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team and Personal Property Systems Team
216	In Transit Phone Numbers	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services
223	Personal Watercraft	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Services
226	Item 508 – Crating Rates, International Solicitation	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
229	SIT & Warehouse Handling Rates - Okinawa	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
230	Inadequate Payment for Origin Services - Terminated Shipments	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
231	Contact Information for Base Transportation or PPSOs	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team and Personal Property Systems Team
232	Waiting Time for Security Delays	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
233	Fuel Price Adjustment for DPM/NTS	American Moving and Storage Association POV and Storage Team

OLD BUSINESS (continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
234	Non-Temporary Storage - Rate Adjustments	Household Goods Forwarders Association POV and Storage Team
235	GSA Request for Documentation	American Moving and Storage Association
236	Flexibility of Dates of Service	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services

NEW BUSINESS TOPICS

244	DTR Change 1	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
245	Long Carries - Excessive Distance	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
246	Acceptance of LOIs	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
247	TQAP per DTR appx. BM para C.7.c	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
248	1840 Appeals	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
249	Submission of DD 1840 to the Origin TO	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
250	Certification of SIT Storage on DD619-1	Household Goods Forwarders Association Operations Team
251	Elimination of GBLs	American Moving and Storage Association Personal Property Programs Division and Systems Services Division
252	Issuance of GBL - Block 18 Preparation	Household Goods Forwarders Association Systems Services Division and Military Services
253	Application – Enforcement of the “Prompt Payment Act”	Household Goods Forwarders Association Defense Finance and Accounting Service and General Services Administration
254	U.S. Customs Documentation - Enhanced Compliance	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services

NEW BUSINESS TOPICS (continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
255	Air Force Regionalization Implementation	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services (U.S. Air Force)
256	Air Force – Claim Set-Off Appeals	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services (USAF)
257	Depreciation on Claims - “Expensive Wood”	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Claims Services
258	On-time Household Goods Performance	Personal Property Division

ITEM: 122

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: 619 Forms and the DTR

INITIATED: March 1, 2000

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I, in September 1999, the USTRANSCOM representative failed to notify Industry that the DTR - Part IV had been issued six weeks prior to the M/I, on August 2. The first indication that the DTR - Part IV had been approved was provided in late October, with an official copy provided to the Associations in December. We further learned that the DTR included a new version of the DD Form 619, dated October 1998. No mention of the new 619 form was made to Industry at any point within the first year of the form's existence.

Efforts to revise the DD Form 619 were the subject of several M/I items and other meetings in the early 1990s, but our records indicate that these discussions ceased in 1993 when Ms. Vivian Washington, the original point of contact, was assigned other duties in a reorganization of MTMC. We were therefore completely surprised to learn that a different version of the form was finalized and published five years later. As an example, one of the suggestions being considered was to combine the two forms.

DOD often espouses the virtues of partnering with Industry. Partnership requires some communication, and this type of form that is used on a regular basis by the Industry should have some Industry input in its design. Furthermore, once a new form is adopted, DOD needs to let us know and provide an adequate lead-time to eliminate stocks of the old version and print copies of the new one prior to implementation.

RECOMMENDATION: Military and Industry representatives should work together to determine whether the new version of the DD Form 619 and 619-1 will meet everyone's needs, including whether the forms should be combined. If the new version is determined to be superior, movers should be permitted to phase in usage of the form after exhausting their existing supplies. Some military bases are requiring agents to start using the form on April 1, 2000, or some other arbitrary date. They should be advised to work with agents to transition to

whatever version makes the most sense. Finally, Industry should be advised if any other forms are being revised.

RESPONSE: Industry expressed concern as to why the loss and damage section is on the new DD Form 619. USTRANSCOM will reexamine the 619 forms and suggested Industry provides input on problems they are experiencing with the new 619.

Industry requested to continue the use of the old DD Form 619 until their stockpile is depleted. The old DD Form 619 may be used until September 30, 2001; afterwards, Industry must use the new DD Form 619 in accordance with the newly published DTR.

August 15, 2000: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until all supplies are exhausted. Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH.

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

February 7, 2002: It was agreed during the 15 Aug 00 meeting that "Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH." To date, we have received no input for proposed changes to the DD 619. It should be noted that making a change to a DD form takes about 8 months to coordinate through OSD with all of the Services. Recommend this item be closed. Proposed changes will be worked when they are submitted.

SUMMARY: Industry will use the old forms until supplies are exhausted. Industry will identify any problems encountered with the new forms and report them to MTMC. Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR. Industry also has doubts on if there will be enough of the new DD Form 619 available.

STATUS: CLOSED. See February 7, 2002 entry above.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 123

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command and
Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: New 619

INITIATED: March 1, 2000

DISCUSSION: There is no longer a 6-cube carton. It has been replaced with an 8-cube carton. Why?

Also, on the SIT section there is a new block called “ordered out” (13e). What is the purpose of this block?

If SIT delivery and re-weighs are supposed to be entered on the 619-1, why are they also listed on the 619?

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should respond to the questions and explain how these forms are to be used.

RESPONSE:

The DD Form 619, Oct 1998 has a place for the 6-cube carton listed under Accessorial Services (16v.) that reads “Cartons (over 4 cu. ft/less than 7cu. Ft.).”

The “ordered out” block is the date the Transportation Office would like property delivered out. The “Delivered Out” block is the actual date the property is delivered.

The Transportation Office has the choice to ask for a reweigh at any point of travel before the destination. The DD Form 619 “says if applicable” if not applicable please don’t use.

RESPONSE: *Industry expressed concern as to why the loss and damage section is on the new DD Form 619. Mr. Mike Cress said USTRANSCOM will reexamine the 619 form and suggested Industry provide input on problems they are experiencing with the new 619.*

Industry requested to continue the use of the old DD Form 619 until their stockpile is depleted. The old DD Form 619 may be used until September 30, 2001; afterwards, Industry must use the new DD Form 619 in accordance with the newly published DTR.

August 15, 2000: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until all supplies are exhausted. Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH.

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

February 7, 2002: It was agreed during the 15 Aug 00 meeting that "Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH." To date, we have received no input for proposed changes to the DD 619. It should be noted that making a change to a DD form takes about 8 months to coordinate through OSD with all of the Services. Recommend this item be closed. Proposed changes will be worked when they are submitted.

SUMMARY: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until the supplies are exhausted. After that date Industry will use the new form and submit any problems with it to MTMC.

Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR.

STATUS: CLOSED. See February 7, 2002 entry above.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 149

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)

SUBJECT: Defense Transportation Regulations (DTR) - Part IV

INITIATED: August 15, 2000

DISCUSSION: Through various channels it was determined that the newly issued DTR (August 1999) would require a review and amendment.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry should be provided an update on the status of the USTRANSCOM review and re-write/amendment of the DTR – Part IV.

RESPONSE:

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

SUMMARY: Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

STATUS: Closed (Consolidated under Item 244).

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 150

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)

SUBJECT: Updates to DTR - Part IV

INITIATED: August 15, 2000

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I meeting, USTRANSCOM indicated that they were working on updates or revisions to the new DTR - Part IV. This document is obviously very important to the industry, and we would like to be involved in these revisions.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should provide an update on the progress of the DTR revisions detailing which items are being revised or updated and the impact of the revisions.

RESPONSE:

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

SUMMARY: Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

STATUS: Closed (Consolidated under Item 244).

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 177

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: Review of Transit Guide (Transit Times)

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: The DTS has many errors in labeling and actual omission in the transit times guide. This has been pointed out to MTMC a number of times with no action/correction to date.

Example: Page BK19 shows GE and is in fact GE, however BK23 is labeled GE and so is BK27. Pages BK33 through 40 are all marked NE. This should be corrected.

In addition, the transit time guides themselves have to be reviewed and adjusted for the continuing deteriorating (and vanishing) American Flag ocean carrier service available.

RECOMMENDATION: That the DTS be reviewed/corrected and that Transit Time guides be adjusted with operative input from industry, including the American Flag steamship operators.

RESPONSE: *USTRANSCOM stated in response to the first part of Item 177, the problem with Appendix BK, as well as a similar problem with Appendix BL, have been identified to us and corrected versions will appear in Change 1 to the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) Part IV, Personal Property.*

MTMC agrees the transit times need to be reviewed and changed as necessary, and will develop a plan to make corrections. MTMC desires to have all transit times not to exceed 60 days. MTMC will follow on with Industry to resolve transit discrepancies. This review should be completed by 9 November 2001.

SUMMARY:

February 19, 2002: MTMC met with AMSA on 28 November 2001 to discuss this item MTMC and completed its review. Need feedback from HHGFAA on transit times with less than 10 days and greater than 70 days. MTMC had completed a new transit table for International ITGBL and presently working the Domestic. The DTR will be tentatively released to the Federal Register in February 2002. Transit times changes will be incorporated with the DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to

comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

HHGFAA will provide MTMC with a list of recommended exceptions to the transit times.

STATUS/ESTIMATED CLOSURE: CLOSED 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 179

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: All Codes - Overtime Loading and Delivery Charges

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: The current “rates per cwt” for Overtime loading and unloading service for both Domestic and International do not come close to covering or providing proper compensation to the Agent for manpower costs associated with the service.

RECOMMENDATION: The per cwt rates should be reviewed and drastically increased to cover the cost of the service OR be changed to be payable “by the hour” at the published overtime hourly rates.

RESPONSE: MTMC will make a decision pending data received from Industry. MTMC wants to look at data for both cwt and hourly rates.

SUMMARY: HHGFAA requested that MTMC provide them a list of what data MTMC requires on overtime rates and freight time rates.

STATUS: Received input from Industry on 11 September 2002. Upon completion of analysis MTMC will contact Industry with the results.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 180

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team and
Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: Special Solicitations - Bidding/Award Process

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: Industry believes that additional emphasis needs to be focused on reforming the bidding process for the Special Solicitations.

In reviewing the rates submitted and the awards, one can easily conclude that the winning Carrier has purposely filed administrative low rates to most areas, then inflated the rate for the volume locations.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should either change the way in which they bid/award the Special Solicitations, or start scrutinizing the bids to identify and eliminate the "manipulators."

RESPONSE: *MTMC does scrutinize the bids IAW the International solicitation. Chapter 10 Item 1000 b states that rates will be reviewed for consistency with other rates submitted for the same rate area as well as adjacent areas. Suspect areas will be reviewed by HQMTMC on a case-by-case basis. Carriers may be required to provide the rate construction breakdown of the suspect rate in accordance with item 326.*

Review consistency. Since our recent Transit item evaluation we have discovered many channels that had 10 or less shipments. We are reviewing the Special solicitation channels and will be removing channels that now warrant a rate area. Special solicitation was never designed to be permanent. It was to be used for one or two rate cycles to allow time for an analysis to determine if an area constitutes a rate area. MTMC is automating the special solicitation process and it will be available for winter cycle 02.

SUMMARY: *HHGFAA requests MTMC provide documentation on what methodology was used on developing the bidding process, identify what of the 90% was completed, and what is included in the testing.*

STATUS: *Open. MTMC is at 90% of a final product. System will be ready by IW02 for testing with Industry.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *After testing is completed, implementation is scheduled for IS03.*

ITEM: 189

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Transit Times - Code 4 Shipments - Korea to Hawaii

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: In the past, carriers had the option of sending Code 4 shipments from Korea to Hawaii via the West Coast. They would be loaded into a west coast bound container with CONUS freight, reworked at the west coast port and loaded into a different container destined to Hawaii.

With the advent of Code 3 this is no longer operationally possible. Containers must now go directly from Korea to Hawaii. There is not always sufficient enough freight to do this on a regular basis and, reportedly, the steamship lines will not accept LCL cargo.

Therefore, the carriers have no choice but to hold the Korea to Hawaii cargo until there's enough for a full container. As a result, shipments are prone to miss their RDDs.

Penalizing carriers for this under TQAP will not make a difference in the service provided. The missed RDDs are being caused by the switch to Code 3, not improper traffic management on our part.

RECOMMENDATION: Review/change the transit times to take into consideration that Code 4 shipments can no longer be co-loaded to the West Coast as in the past.

RESPONSE: *Carriers should have submitted a proposal on Code 3 and Code 4 transit time changes to USTRANSCOM for Chg 1 of the DTR. Carriers also have the options such as the use of a 20-foot container instead of a 40-foot with the steamship lines or shipping a container that is partially filled. The DTR Draft was posted on the Federal Register for Industry review at that point any changes should have been suggested. USTRANSCOM is reviewing Industry input for inclusion into the DTR. Proposed updates will be coordinated with MTMC and Military Services (as applicable) within the next 30 Days. Once coordination is completed and determination is made regarding the inputs, USTRANSCOM will announce their finding via Federal Register.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed. Project date of posting on Federal Register in November 2002.*

ITEM: 193

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Service
And Storage and POV Team

SUBJECT: Getting Paid for NTS

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: NTS contractors have to send out 3 and 4 invoices in an effort to be paid for their service. The average time to receive payment seems to be about 150 days. Some times it is over 1 year before payment is issued. The contractors are not getting paid interest either. They are following the instructions issued by RSMO but still get no response.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should clarify what steps NTS contractors need to take in order to be paid promptly. Who can they contact in order to expedite the process?

RESPONSE: DFAS-Norfolk stated there are several reasons that a payment of an invoice may be delayed. The following are some of those reasons:

1. Quarterly storage bills--if one line doesn't clear, the whole invoice stays in preval until that one line clears. Some of the problems we have related to this item are:

a. Lapsed lines of accounting (This doesn't happen too often)

b. No obligation

c. Insufficient obligation

d. No document number

e. Incomplete line of accounting

f. Most of the invoices go to preval because we pay Army, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy lines of accounting on these bills

2. Invoices are not certified in accordance with the PPCD Form. The invoice received and material received and accepted dates are either not there or we can't tell which date applies to which field. (We would call for information if we had a POC and phone number).

3. If Coast Guard accounting is referenced, we have to either return the invoice or make a partial payment and still return the invoice for just the Coast Guard line. These lines should never be sent to us for payment.

The certifying officer of your invoice should be contacted to expedite the certification process. If the bill has been forwarded to the finance office, the bill will be paid as expeditiously as possible but may run into the problems stated above.

The Army will review any problems internally on a case-by-case basis.

***SUMMARY/STATUS:** Open. MTMC and the Military Services are participating in a DFAS sponsored solution for NTS payment issues. In the interim, MTMC will review any specific problem on a case-by-case basis.*

***ESTIMATED CLOSURE:** Closed. Mr. Russ Plasiance of DFAS will discuss this item at the M/I on 18 September 2002. There is no immediate date for a remedy.*

ITEM: 202

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: Defense Transportation Regulations - Part IV

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: Industry was advised several months ago that Change 1 would be issued to Part IV of the DTR in the Spring of 2001. No information or Federal Register Notice has appeared to date.

RECOMMENDATION: Please advise the status of Change 1 to the DTR-Part IV and, if known, the targeted date of release for public comment, as well as any planned effective date of the changes.

RESPONSE: Combine this item with the following items:

Item 122, 619 Forms and the DTR

Item 123, New 619

Item 149, Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) – Part IV

Item 150, Updates to DTR – Part IV

SUMMARY: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

STATUS: Closed (Consolidated under Item 244).

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 203

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team and
Military Services

SUBJECT: Electronic Transmission of Documents

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: At the continued urging of the Federal Government and MTMC, the Industry has invested in and expanded the use of automated systems that now have the ability to transmit documentation electronically.
However, many installations will only accept documentation by facsimile and refuse to accept documentation that is transmitted electronically by email.

Ironically, MTMC now transmits its messages and documentation to Industry by either postings to the MTMC Web Site or email messages with attached files or downloads.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC and the various shipping activities and installations should be instructed by DoD to accept “electronically transmitted” documentation.
This practice would actually create a better ‘date certain’ record of transmission and/or receipt from which all parties could benefit.

RESPONSE: *USTRANSCOM agrees that there are benefits in the use of electronically transmitted documentation. However, the Military Services must make the final resolution of this issue. USTRANSCOM proposes that MTMC address these issues with the Services in an attempt to negotiate an agreement and to draft a set of formal procedures. If an agreement can be reached, USTRANSCOM will coordinate the draft procedures for inclusion into the next change of DTR Part IV.*

USTRANSCOM and MTMC will work with the Military Services and Industry to determine what electronic documentation is being refused by the Transportation Offices.

MTMC recommends the following:

The Transportation Office and Claims Office reserve the right to request originals. All forms must be scanned and submitted in a .PDF format, faxed, or mailed.

1. DD Form 1780, Shipment Evaluation and Inspection Record.

2. *DD Form 2497, Carrier Evaluation Work Sheet Report.*
3. *DD Form 1840, Joint Statement of Loss or Damage at Delivery.*
4. *DD Form 1840R, Notice of Loss or Damage.*
5. *DD Form 1814, Carrier Warning/ Suspension/ Reinstatement/ Cancellation of Warning.*
6. *PPGBL/BL*
7. *Carrier Appeals will be accepted submitted electronically, but the carrier will be ultimately responsible for ensuring the appeals are submitted the correct POC.*

Industry must hold on to the original documentation or have a certified true copy available for 3 years.

MTMC needs to know from Industry what other documents need to be submitted.

The Military Services need to agree on a uniform format for reports and notify Industry of its decision. Industry will head the search for the required reports and formats.

SUMMARY: This item was discussed at the symposium on February 27, 2002.

STATUS: Received No Negative replies from the Military Services. PDF format will be used for the electronically transmitted documentation.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 205

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Baggage Pick up or Delivery from SIT

INITIATED: September 11, 2002

DISCUSSION: The current rate of \$10.78 per gcwt in the International Solicitation does not adequately reflect actual costs of pick up or delivery from SIT.
A rate increase will encourage a larger number of eligible carriers to participate in baggage traffic.

The minimum baggage pick up or delivery from SIT rate in the International Solicitation should be brought in line with the Domestic rate level of \$68.70.
A CONUS baggage pick-up or delivery procedure is the same whether the shipment originated overseas or in CONUS.

RECOMMENDATION: A rate of \$29.26, which is the median geographic zone rate (Schedule J for 500 - 641 lbs.) would properly compensate for pick up or delivery to/from SIT for baggage shipments.

Increase minimum baggage pick up or delivery rate in the International Solicitation to \$68.70.

RESPONSE: *MTMC requests specific data from Industry to determine what the proper rate should be.*

SUMMARY: *MTMC requested information from Industry on how their data was arrived.*

STATUS: *Received input from Industry on 11 September 2002. Upon completion of analysis, MTMC will contact Industry with results.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 211

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team and
Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: TDR - Class 2 Rates - Low Volume Areas

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: For Each rate channel there is a separate TDR where the carriers are ranked by their TQAP score. The carrier with the highest score is tendered the first shipment, the second shipment is tendered to the carrier with the second highest score; and the process continues in this manner. However, the TO also establishes an arbitrary "tonnage threshold" before moving from the highest carrier to the next. In example, the tonnage threshold could be 10,000 pounds, which means the highest or higher rated carriers receive a greater number of shipments to satisfy the threshold.

When the six month rate cycle ends and a new rate cycle begins, the TO starts the new cycle with a new TDR. In a "Low Volume Area" it is almost impossible for carriers with an acceptable score of 90 or better to ever receive the award of a shipment.

The arbitrary tonnage threshold and the TQAP program are inadvertently punishing carriers who provide satisfactory service.

RECOMMENDATION: A system should be in place for Low Volume Areas that equally distributes the traffic among the carriers maintaining satisfactory scores so that they don't lose their place in line. The rate cycle ends before the volume of traffic can make it down the list or the arbitrary tonnage threshold was set to high.

RESPONSE: *MTMC requested to know where this action is happening. Industry responded this action is happening in Iceland and the Azores. MTMC (TOPS) will look at how the Transportation Offices in these two locations conduct business.*

February 13, 2002: Based on information obtained through TOPS, shipments were booked in accordance with DTR. We will review at the end of FY02 to ensure shipments are properly awarded.

Typical results from IS01:

Iceland to US11

Primary Carrier 17,351 lbs.

M/T Carriers: 9,740
 4,567
 10,651
 8,683

SUMMARY: *MTMC informed Industry that it would accept Industry's recommendation as a tasking. TOPS will run another report at the end of FY02.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 1 May 2002 Waiting the reevaluation of the TOPS report for FY02.*

ITEM: 216

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services and Personal Property System Team

SUBJECT: In Transit Phone Numbers

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: In order to assist with reducing the need for SIT by facilitating direct deliveries, it would be helpful for PPSOs and PPPOs to include in-transit telephone numbers on the GBL when available. Many service members have cell phones or know a place where they can be reached during the time of transit. This step goes hand-in-hand with the use of toll-free numbers by the carriers. It is helpful for the customer to be able to reach the carrier as easily as possible, but it is also important for the carrier to reach the customer, especially when it is approaching time to effect delivery.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should encourage PPSOs and PPPOs to include in-transit telephone numbers on the GBL.

RESPONSE: *This issue will be taken under review. The Military Services and MTMC need to discuss before providing a response to this item. This item was discussed at the last Personal Property Coordinating Council (PPCC) in January 2002.*

MTMC will draft a message to the Military Services for their concurrence to put additional data information in Block 25.

SUMMARY: *MTMC informed Industry on the PPCC proposal that MTMC Information Management insert a mandatory field into the TOPS bill of lading for the Service Members' intransit phone number and e-mail address.*

STATUS: *26 July 2002 - In Transit Phone Numbers - The STATUS was erroneously reported on 3 Jun 02. The Military Services did not concur at the JDT. The Military Services agreed to have the email addresses to print out on the DD1299 for origin, intransit, and destination addresses. A TOP currently has it in the queue for processing (SCR 332). Scheduled to be implemented in ICP 9.7, 2nd Qtr FY03.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Military Services and Personal Property System Team made it mandatory in the TOPS System for an email in-transit address but not the phone number. The projected date of the implementation is 31 Mar 2002*

ITEM: 223

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services

SUBJECT: Personal Watercraft

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: Many newer models of personal watercraft exceed 14 ft. in length when measured on their trailers.

Inclusion of Personal Watercraft as an entitled item in a household goods shipment has placed an unfair economic burden on the International Carrier.

In most every case the carrier loses money when required to crate and ship personal watercraft with trailers. Costs far exceed compensation.

RECOMMENDATION: Personal watercraft exceeding 14 feet in overall length, including trailer, should transit under the OTO program.

RESPONSE: *On January 28, 2002, the Military Services and MTMC met and agreed the Military Services will decide by 31 March 2002 whether to ship Ultralite Aircraft and personal watercraft exceeding 14 feet overall length under the One-Time-Only program.*

30 July 2002: *The Military Services will discuss this issue with the Per Diem Committee on the definition of a personal watercraft.*

SUMMARY: *The Services recommendation is for Personal Watercraft to be classified as a boat. Ultralite Aircrafts and Personal Watercraft exceeding 14 feet will move under the One-Time-Only Program.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 226

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Item 508 - Crating Rates, International Solicitation

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: Industry wishes to re-instate this Item as being “Open,” based on the fact that resolution was not achieved in anticipated action described by MTMC in Item #129 found in the M/I “Summary Agenda” for the meeting of August 15, 2000.

That item’s ‘Response’ indicated that the “...industry will obtain an increase effective April 1, 2001.” At the time of the M/I meeting, MTMC would not divulge the amount of the increase.

In actuality there was an increase granted in international crating rates, however, it is the opinion of the Industry that the rates are still not compensatory with the labor and material costs to the carriers/agents.

Furthermore, even with the increase in international crating rates there still exists a disparity between international crating rates and those found in the domestic solicitation, for an identical service and cost basis.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry requests that the rates for crating in the international Solicitation be brought in line with the Domestic Solicitation.

RESPONSE: MTMC will review the current crate charges for the International Rate Solicitation and make a determination on this issue by June 1, 2002.

SUMMARY: Industry informed MTMC that there may be additional charges due to certification of wood materials required for shipping crates and specialized crating.

STATUS/ ESTIMATE CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002 Industry has not supplied a schedule of increase charges due to the EU certification of wood material.

ITEM: 229

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: SIT & Warehouse Handling Rates – Okinawa

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: The military agents operating in Okinawa respectfully request special consideration is extended to their area for a review and increase in rates for storage-in-transit and warehouse handling.

Further, there appears to be a need to review and/or clarify why the rates in JA96 are separated for HHG and not for Baggage, which appears to be the case in other rate areas.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC review and consider amendments to the rate solicitation, which would provide reasonable compensation for SIT and Warehouse Handling in Okinawa.

RESPONSE: *The Pacific is due for review. Letters will be sent out to all ITGBL carriers requesting their submission of their accessorial charges. The HHGFAA Accessorial Committee assistance is requested to ensure their members submit in a timely manner. Please note all rates submitted must be notarized or they will not be accepted. No extensions or exceptions will be granted. These charges are reviewed every 2 years. The results will be forwarded to the Military Services for their concurrence or nonconcurrence. If concurred, the changed rate will be effective by IS03.*

SUMMARY: *MTMC requested that Industry submit their rates by certified mail.*

STATUS/ESTIMATE CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002. Industry has submitted costs and data that will be given to the Military Services for review. Upon approval by the Military Services changes will be published in the International Rate Solicitation .*

ITEM: 230

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Inadequate Payment for Origin Services - Terminated Shipments

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: Item 522 (Terminated Shipments) allows only \$19.20 per ncwt. for origin services on shipments that pick-up in CONUS and are “terminated” at origin. For overseas origins \$29.81 per ncwt. is allowed. Very few origin agents work at these low unrealistic rates.

In CONUS, origin rates can be \$10 to \$15 higher, not including the carriers’ administrative costs for handling the shipment prior to termination. Overseas (actual) origin rates (e.g. Korea) can be twice as high as what is allowed in the solicitation. The carrier will, therefore, suffer a loss on almost every shipment terminated at origin.

RECOMMENDATION: The amounts paid to carriers for shipments terminated at origin should be reviewed and updated to reflect actual real-world costs.

RESPONSE: *MTMC needs data from HHGFAA.*

SUMMARY: *This item was discussed and Industry requested that baggage be included in the review and updates.*

STATUS: *Received input from Industry on 11 September 2002. Upon completion of analysis, MTMC will contact Industry with results.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 231

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team, Personal Property Systems and Carrier Qualification

SUBJECT: Contact Information for Base Transportation or PPSOs

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: Contact information for base transportation or personal property offices is often inaccurate, incomplete or out of date. It is often difficult for a carrier to determine the exact address to use when submitting an LOI or DD1840, appealing a TQAP score, providing notification of a possible late shipment or corresponding with a base for any number of reasons.

It is not unusual for a comparison of a transportation office's address as shown on their letterhead, the return address portion of the envelop and its listing in the rate solicitation, to yield three different addresses. The most recent listing of the Rate Solicitation I-13 includes transportation offices that are now closed and does not include new transportation offices such as Travis AFB and Seal Beach, both in California.

Not knowing how to contact or communicate with a transportation office hinders the carrier's ability to comply with the MTMC regulations and may also hinder the level of service provided the member; not to mention the negative impact on a carrier's score and ability to be awarded new traffic volumes.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC (and the Military Services) should develop a method that makes available to the carriers a complete and current listing of transportation offices. This could possibly be accomplished through a web site.

In addition to phone, fax and mailing addresses (incl: APO/FPO), the listings should also include email addresses since email is now a common means of communications. To keep them current, those email addresses should be for offices or departments, not for individuals who may leave or rotate out.

If this information already exists in the suggested format, Industry requests to be given access and/or provided knowledge as to how it may be located.

RESPONSE: Recommend the carrier industry refer to the PPCIG on MTMC's website for the most current information for all transportation offices. The international rate solicitation effective IW02 will no longer contain PPSO listings, it will simply refer you to the PPCIG on MTMC's website.

SUMMARY: Industry requested that the PPSOs use a common POC e-mail/mail address and multiple facsimile phone numbers instead of an actual person POC for each PPSO. MTMC stated it would draft a message to the PPSOs to update the PPCIG entries on e-mail and mailing addresses.

STATUS/ ESTIMATE CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002. MTMC will continue to use its website to provide up to date PPCIG guidance and other personal property related information.

ITEM: 232

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Waiting Time for Security Delays

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: The original purpose of waiting time was to provide the Transportation Office with adequate time to get the service member to the house to receive the shipment, so it did not have to go into storage. Waiting time is now being applied in a different context when the moving crew is prevented from reaching the base by long lines at security checkpoints. If a job was going to take eight hours to complete, crews are now being forced to work overtime because of having to wait in line before actually starting to work.

RECOMMENDATION: Waiting time should be paid from the beginning of the time the mover is forced to wait as a result of a government security checkpoint, without having to wait the one or two hours that would otherwise apply once the mover arrives at residence and the service member cannot be located.

RESPONSE: *Waiting time provided in the solicitation does not restrict where waiting occurs. The International and Domestic solicitations indicate how many free hours of waiting time is allowed and should be reflected in the carrier rates.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 233

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Storage and POV Team

SUBJECT: Fuel Price Adjustment for DPM/NTS

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: Some NTS and DPM contractors are having difficulty in receiving compensation for the added costs of fuel they experienced last year. We realize that contracts are for specified duration and that prices are locked in. However, certain unusual circumstances that are above and beyond the control of the contractor and for which the contractor could not have envisioned such costs should be treated in the same way as all other transportation providers to the Federal Government have been allowed to increase their price by the fuel surcharge approved by the DOD Fuel Surcharge Board. In many cases these contracts lock in a price for five years and in the case of NTS contractors, they permit a price increase only twice a year. The Government does not want contractors to operate at a deficit and they should not be discriminated against.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should explain how NTS and DPM contractors should go about obtaining a reasonable fuel cost adjustment in their contracts.

RESPONSE: *This issue needs to be addressed to the local contracting officer. DPM contracts are negotiated at each base thru the local base contracting office. The existing Fuel-Related Rate adjustment formula presently utilized for Transportation and Travel for lines haul shipments could be incorporated into the ITOs local DPM contract.*

SUMMARY: *This item refers to the situation carriers face when working in the NY/NJ Metro area around Fort Hamilton. Industry wants to negotiate a new fuel cost adjustment with the Government. The Army stated it would check with Fort Hamilton contract office on fuel costs. The Military Services will take this issue on to see if an economic adjustment is warranted.*

STATUS: *It is believe that the NTS adjustment was addressed with the RSMO determination to allow rates to be increased in a quarterly basis. The issue with the DPM contract must be addressed with the installation Contracting Officer to seek relief under the FAR. MTMC's only connection with the DPM is maintaining the uniform PWS in DTR IV.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *Closed 18 September 2002*

ITEM: 234

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Storage and POV Team

SUBJECT: Non-Temporary Storage - Rate Adjustments

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: The Basic Agreement between the Government and the Non-Temporary Storage Contractor allows for rate changes downward every month or 12 times a year, should the contractor choose to 'reduce' his rate. However, conversely, the rate schedule only allows for 'increases' in rates two times a year, which would appear to be unfair or unbalanced to all parties.

This means that the Contractor has limited ability to provide for economic adjustments on such things as fuel price escalations, increases in insurance premiums, or unforeseen operational difficulties, such as the recent terrorist activities in New York.

We take this opportunity to point out that the recently adopted Fuel Adjustment Policy did not encompass services provided by NTS or DPM contractors.

It is also interesting to note that some non-temporary agreements do not allow for a contractor to submit a new rate schedule, that might offer an overall saving to the government, should that proposed rate schedule have one line item that is being increased.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC and/or parties responsible for the Military contracting activities should review the agreements governing Non-Temporary Storage with the aim of amending those agreements to allow for a contractor to receive equitable treatment and fair compensation.

RESPONSE: *The Military Services feel the Rate Agreement should remain in effect with the current rate cycle.*

SUMMARY: *This item refers to the situation carriers face when working in the NY/NJ Metro area around Fort Hamilton. Industry wants to negotiate a new fuel cost adjustment with the Government. The Army stated it would check with Fort Hamilton contract office on fuel costs. The Military Services will take this issue on to see if an economic adjustment is warranted.*

STATUS: It is believe the NTS adjustment was addressed with the RSMO determination to allow rates to be increased on a quarterly basis.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 235

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: General Service Administration and
Defense Finance and Accounting Service
And Personal Property Systems

SUBJECT: GSA Requests for Documentation

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: Many carriers are now receiving large requests for back up documents on invoices that were sent in several years ago and are now being audited by GSA Audits. At the time, carriers were told by DFAS that they did not need to send in the paperwork. Having to go back through files several years later to reconstruct the information poses a tremendous burden on the industry. GSA has recognized this by its agreement to refrain from making this type of request during our peak season. They have also indicated that they are requesting backup documentation on less than half of the shipments they are auditing, and we appreciate their efforts to focus on just the shipments where there is an apparent problem.

RECOMMENDATION: DFAS and GSA need to get together and work out a procedure for performing audits and retaining the necessary documents so that industry does not have to search through old records to find paperwork that DFAS doesn't want or can't handle.

We support DFAS' automation efforts, but they need to ensure that automation doesn't come back two years later with massive document requests.

RESPONSE: *GSA and DFAS are currently working this issue. Our future program will be a system that includes a pre-audit capability.*

SUMMARY: *GSA said that documentation being submitted has incomplete data on the EDI billings. Industry stated that GSA and DFAS should get the TOPS data from the PPSOs since they were the ones who submitted the billing.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *CLOSED. The GSA requests for missing information are at this point exclusively on EDI transactions as DFAS will not pay incomplete paper billings. GSA has been unsuccessful in getting PPSO to enter all the necessary information on EDI transactions.*

ITEM: 236

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services

SUBJECT: Flexibility on Dates of Service

INITIATED: February 27, 2002

DISCUSSION: MTMC should remind PPSOs again that they have the flexibility to adjust pickup dates and RDDs at the request of the carrier at any time after a shipment has been awarded to a carrier. It is in their best interests to be cooperative and work with the carriers when there is no inconvenience to the member to make the change. This would help to reduce the cost of SIT, allow for more efficient use of capacity, and avoid double handling of shipments. Many PPSOs continue to refuse to change RDDs either after the shipment is accepted, or after it is loaded, saying that the carrier is now bound by that contract and they can't change it. This is a widespread problem, not limited to any specific PPSO's. This even came up at the JPPSO COS meeting where there was a difference of opinion among PPSO personnel at the meeting with some thinking they absolutely could not change the RDD once the shipment had been tendered.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should remind PPSOs again that they have the flexibility to adjust pickup dates and RDDs at any time after a shipment has been awarded to a carrier.

RESPONSE: *The carrier, service member, and PPSOs must all agree on the adjustments to the Dates of Service. The Military Services always put out reminders in the summer message to the PPSOs to be flexible.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *CLOSED. Sue Ducombs will brief on this Item at the Symposium.*

ITEM: 244

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: DTR Change 1

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: DOD has sought industry comments on Change 1 to the DTR. Comments have been submitted, including some pointing out the need for advance lead-time before the effective date of the changes.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should indicate what the timetable is for release of Change 1 and for its effective date.

SUMMARY: *DTR Draft was posted on the Federal Register for Industry review. USTRANSCOM is reviewing Industry input for inclusion into the DTR. Proposed update to be coordinated with MTMC and the Military Services (as applicable) within the next 30 days. Once coordination is complete and final determination is made regarding inputs, a Federal Register notice will be made announcing findings.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *CLOSED. Projected date of posting on Federal Register is November 2002.*

ITEM: 245

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Long Carries - Excessive Distance

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: In the International Solicitation, page 4-23 (b), it states; “Shipments picked up or delivered to a residence, with construction or other safety factors that prevent the carrier (through no fault of their own) normal carry access within 75 feet, the PPSO can authorize an excessive distance carry charge. Approval must be granted prior to the service being performed.” Item 432, Application of the Single Factor Rate (SFR), says that the SFR will include excessive distance. When reviewing the wording above (reference to NORMAL), is this to indicate that anything over 75 feet is not considered to be normal; and should not the Carrier be compensated for providing a non-normal service.

RECOMMENDATION: Allow ITGBL Carriers to bill approved ‘excessive distance’ charges over 75 feet at the current rate as shown in the Domestic Solicitation.

SUMMARY: *After reviewing the International Solicitation within 75 feet is normal. The reason for including the statement “Shipments picked up or delivered to a residence, with construction or other safety factors that prevent the carrier normal carry access within 75 feet the PPSO can authorize an excessive distance carry charge” in the event construction is progress and your have to walk around the area more than you would normally the PPSO has the authority to authorize excess distance.*

STATUS/ESTIMATE CLOSURE: *CLOSED 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 246

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic & International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Acceptance of LOIs

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: On the top of the LOI, in block "D", section marked "For PPSO Use only" there is a section that the PPSO uses to mark when the LOI becomes effective. For ITGBL, they use the next rate cycle (either IS or IW followed by the year). However, many PPSO's are also marking domestic LOI's the same way. For example, if I file an LOI on 6/1/02, many PPSO's will mark it as effective for DW02, which does not start till 11/1/02. This is despite the fact that there is L/C filing periods that allow a carrier/forwarder to come on in the domestic program mid-cycle. We have found that some PPSO's aren't adding the carrier/agent to the TDR immediately, but are waiting till the next full cycle. This has been discovered when calling PPSO's to see why we are not receiving any business.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should send out a clarification/guidance message that the PPSO should put the current date down for any domestic LOI, but use the next rate cycle for ITGBL LOI's only. MTMC should remind the PPSO that carriers should be placed on the domestic TDR upon the effective date of the L/C rates (after acceptance of the LOI), and not waiting for the next beginning of a rate cycle. This message would also help remind the PPSO to load the rates from the L/C filing, as a few bases forget this step each cycle.

SUMMARY: *A LOI message will advise PPSO's of proper procedures for LOI acceptance. Message should be out within the next 30 days.*

ESTIMATE CLOSURE: *CLOSED. 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 247

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification & Performance Team

SUBJECT: TQAP per DTR appx. BM para C.7.c

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: The carriers are frequently not being notified of their semi-annual performance score by the ITO as required, "...No later than 30 calendar days prior to the effective date of the following 6 month rate cycle."

While this para sets a requirement on the ITO, it fails to identify a consequence if the standard is not met. The requirement recognizes that a carrier must prepare for the new cycle and knowing the performance score is essential to that process. If the carrier score may result in traffic denial in the upcoming cycle, it is paramount for the carrier to be given at least 30 days to research and/or appeal before being denied traffic in the new cycle.

RECOMMENDATION: If the carrier receives their semi-annual performance score and status less than 30 days before the beginning of the new cycle, the carrier should be provided the option of accepting the late score or be granted the carry over score from the previous cycle. The carrier should be given 30 days from the time of receipt to request the carry over score.

RESPONSE AND/OR SUMMARY: *Carriers that have not received their semi-annual evaluation 35 days prior to the effective date of the following rate cycle shall send a report to HQ MTMC, MTPP-HQ. The report will include the carrier's company name, SCAC, and a list of installations (by service) that have not provided the carriers semi-annual evaluation. MTPP-HQ personnel will notify the respective Military service headquarters to resolve the issue.*

Carriers will not be provided the option of carrying over the previous semi-annual score as recommended. This could provide carriers with substandard scores the ability to participate when they should be in traffic denial. Thus allowing a carrier that performed poorly to take business away from a carrier that performed well.

Carriers will be placed on the TDR based on the actual score they earn. Carriers still maintain the right to appeal scores within 45 days as provided in the DTR. If a carrier appeals

their score, and the appeal is upheld, the carrier will be placed on the TDR as outlined in the DTR, Appendix BM, paragraph C.8.b (3).

Paragraph C.8.b (3) states, "If a carrier's appeal to a Carrier Evaluation Worksheet/Report is upheld, the carrier's average shipment score and period of traffic denial (if any) will be adjusted. Further, in cases where the appeal is upheld and the resulting change in the average shipment score moves the carrier from an unsatisfactory to a satisfactory position, the carrier will be reinstated to the TDR and awarded sufficient tonnage to reestablish the carrier's relative position among other carriers on the TDR."

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: 18 September 2002.

ITEM: 248

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualifications & Performance Team

SUBJECT: 1840 Appeals

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: The TQAP process involves carriers providing an 1840 form for scoring purposes. The way TQAP is structured, carriers are penalized if no form is available for scoring, by deducting 40 points from the carrier's TQAP score. Carriers are supposed to have an appeal process, since this score is critical to their ability to obtain business. This form turns out to be difficult to keep track of by the local bases, so they often do not get matched up with the proper file for scoring purposes initially, leading to an appeal by the carrier.

MTMC has recently taken the position that carriers cannot simply provide a copy of the 1840 as their appeal, which has been the standard practice for years. Now MTMC is requiring carriers to prove that they had previously sent the 1840 in a timely manner. Many such appeals are being denied.

RECOMMENDATION: Since the goal here is to measure quality, MTMC should focus more on the content of the 1840 and less on the question of when and how the carrier submitted the form. TQAP should not be about who can process the paperwork correctly and who uses the proper method of "proving" that they sent the form in at a given time. What matters is what is on the form, so MTMC should go back to the process of accepting the 1840 upon appeal, in order to obtain the data needed to develop a quality score.

Unless MTMC is willing to change this appeals standard back to the previous process, we need to explore the question of how a carrier can prove that it submitted the 1840 in a timely manner. Does the carrier need to send all of the 1840s via certified mail? If so, how do you prove which 1840s were sent in which envelope? If the carrier includes a cover letter listing each of the 1840s that are included in the envelope, will the PPSO be willing to confirm that and sign and return the cover letter? We suggest that MTMC encourage and accept the use of faxes and electronic mail, as better alternatives to the expense of certified mail.

RESPONSE AND/OR SUMMARY: Carriers are not being denied the right to appeal TQAP shipment scores in cases where a DD 1840/1840-R was missing. In cases where carriers appealed to the TO, and the TO denied the appeal, some carriers submitted their appeal to HQMTMC. HQMTMC has upheld the carriers appeal in cases where the carrier could provide proof of timely submission of the 1840 to the TO.

The DD Form 1840 is a very important document in regards to scoring shipments. Performance/TQAP scores are important to a carrier. The carrier's score is the driving factor on whether a carrier may participate in the DOD program. The DD Form 1840/1840-R provides pertinent data such as loss and damage, and the date the member received their shipment. These are two of the three scoring elements used under TQAP.

The DTR, Part IV, Appendix BM, paragraph C.4.c (1), states that the "completed DD Form 1840/1840-R will be the primary source document used by the TO, to develop an estimated dollar value as to loss and/or damage sustained to the member's property on the move." The DTR also states in paragraph C.4.c (6), that "Before attempting to score the shipment, origin TOs must ensure the carrier is allowed the maximum time (75 calendar days following shipment delivery) to submit the DD form 1840/1840-R. If the DD Form 1840-R information has not been received by the origin TO at the time the shipment is scored, the TO will compute the score with the information available and annotate the absence of the DD Form 1840-R in the remarks section, "No DD Form 1840-R available at the time of scoring." Without member feedback, no shipment will be scored until at least 90 days of shipment delivery or a DD Form 1840-R has been received. A carrier's customer satisfaction query, signed by the member, is acceptable in lieu of waiting for the DD Form 1840-R."

Timely submission of the DD 1840/1840-R is the responsibility of the carrier. In many cases the TQAP scores being appealed for lack of an 1840, were scored well beyond 90 days of delivery to the customer. All appeals to HQMTMC were adjudicated in accordance with the DTR guidance listed above.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: 18 September 2002. Concur with the industry recommendation that carriers document the submission of DD Form 1840/1840-Rs by use of faxes, emails, or certified mail to the PPSO.

ITEM: 249

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification & Performance Team

SUBJECT: Submission of DD1840 to the Origin TO

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: The ability to appeal for lack of a DD1840 has been eliminated. A shipment score is based on three things that are measurable, on-time pick-up, on-time delivery, and the amount of loss or damage. The submission would be considered a non-scored element. In many cases, 40 points are being removed and appeals are being denied even when no loss or damage has actually occurred. The refusal to review the 1840 during the appeal period is contrary to the provision that states a carrier can appeal a shipment score.

RECOMMENDATION: Allow the appeal process to include the submission of previously missing DD1840.

RESPONSE AND/OR SUMMARY: *This item reiterates item 248. The response to item 248 incorporates the issues in this item.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *18 September 2002. Carriers may appeal their TQAP score. Appeals will be upheld if the DD Form 1840/1840-R is submitted in accordance with the provisions of the DTR, Part IV, Appendix BM, paragraph C.4.c (6).*

ITEM: 250

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Certification of SIT Storage on DD619-1

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: There appears to have been a recent change in MTMC/DOD policy as a recent message (021840Z Jul 02) was distributed by MTMC-HQ stating that ALL Storage-in-Transit (SIT) must be certified by the PPSO on the DD619-1 regardless of the storage periods. The previous requirement for SIT certification did not require a TO signature - if the number of days of SIT were less than 15 on UAB and less than 30 on HHGs. Industry wonders why this additional 'administrative burden' has been placed on the Carriers and Transportation Offices. Further, there appears to be a reluctance by some of the Transportation Offices to provide the carriers with the signatures upon request.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should examine the difference between the old PPTMR and the new DTR confirming if the policy change was indeed intended or simply an oversight. If the policy is to stand, as recently communicated, then a review should be performed in six to twelve months to determine if the impact of the additional workload created by the change result in any saving or additional controls that warrant the continuance of the requirement.

Summary/Response: MTMC disseminated a Traffic Management Advisory message (DTG 041414zSep02) to all PPSOs, the General Services Administration, and finance offices notifying them that the requirement to certify DD Forms 619/619-1 for the initial storage period (30-day increment for HHG and 15-day increment for UB) has been waived until 30 Sep 02. This will apply to ITGBL shipments entering storage on or before 30 Sep 02. MTMC concurs with reviewing the workload impact within six to 12 months.

Estimated Closure: Projected closures date 30 Sep 2002.

ITEM: 251

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Personal Property Programs Division
and Systems Services Division

SUBJECT: Elimination of GBLs

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: GSA's Office of Government wide Policy has abolished the Government Bill of Lading, while giving DOD a waiver through 2002 to accomplish the switch to use of Commercial Bills of Lading. We have heard that MTMC intends to modify TOPS to remove the word "Government" from the TOPS-generated lasers printed GBL in order to meet this requirement, with a possible effective date in October 2002.

Carriers need to have advance notice of any change in this area, so they can make any necessary changes to their automation systems.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should indicate what they are doing with regards to the elimination of the GBL, including a timetable. If the change will involve a change in the numbering system for bills of lading, carriers need to know how many characters will be used in the new numbering system, so that computers can be programmed to accept a Bill of Lading number with that many characters. If there are any other changes to the procedures for bills of lading, carriers need to know those as well to train their personnel.

STATUS/RESPONSE: *Software is under development by the Passenger and Personal Property Systems Office. Completion of this development with the fielding to all TOPS Sites will be accomplished in ICP 9.4.1*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *November 2002.*

ITEM: 252

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Systems Service Division and Military Services

SUBJECT: Issuance of GBL - Block 18 Preparation

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: The DTR instructions for preparation of Block 18 on the GBL are as follows:

Block 18, Consignee Name, destination, delivery address, and rate area code (e.g., US11, US12, US13, etc.) Rate area code is only required on ITGBL shipments.

(1) TGBL Shipments.

(a) Consigned to the Member. Enter the member's name (last name, first name, and middle initial) rank, and activity to which assigned (shipments destined overseas—spell out the name of the activity and country – do not show APO/FPO number) or delivery address, including the street, city, county, state or country, and ZIP code.

The GBL information in Block 18 is resulting in confusing information regarding the exact destination information for ITGBL shipments, especially those where Grafenwhor is the destination Transportation Office. T.O.s are inconsistent in how the information is filled out so that interpretation of the correct destination country is difficult. (Examples can be supplied - if required.)

RECOMMENDATION: *It is recommended to move the rate area information to a different block on the GBL. Block 25 - "Remarks;" Block 27 - "Description of Shipment;" or Block 31 - "Tariff or Special Rate Authorities," would be more appropriate places for this information. Making this change would leave Block 18, "Consignee," clearly indicating the proper destination for the shipment and eliminate any confusion as to where the shipment is supposed to be shipped/delivered.*

RESPONSE: CLOSED. *The item was fixed under two software fixes. SCR 341 fixed the software has been modified to automatically retrieve and populate the correct Rate Area in BASIC application for ITGBL shipments. This fixed was in ICP 9.3 and downloaded to all TOPS sites on April 24, 2002. Also, SCR 123 (6411) to show the correct city and country name in the OCONUS screen in BASIC. Before it would display the responsible destination PPSO Name. This was fixed in ICP 9.3.2 and downloaded to all TOPS site June 25, 2003.*

ITEM: 253

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: DFAS and GSA

SUBJECT: Application - Enforcement of the "Prompt Payment Act"

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: Increasingly it would appear there are a variety of interpretations for the application of the "Prompt Payment Act" leading to confusion as to when the government is liable for the payment of interest to the carriers/warehousemen on both GBL and NTS shipments.

Noting that there has been no 'statutory' changes in the Act advised to the Industry, then presumably there may be confusion or a mis-interpretation on the part of the government paying offices and/or the pre-payment and post-payment auditing firms now utilized by the Military Services and GSA.

RECOMMENDATION: Since GSA is the ultimate entity having control over the final review of carrier invoices it is recommended they be tasked to confirm in writing their application of the Prompt Payment Act in all possible billing/invoicing scenarios for government shipments and storage.

The Industry will then be given the opportunity to review the GSA policy and procedures, indicating where there is need for clarification and/or direct disagreement of applications. Pursuant to those exchanges and discussions, all parties involved can reach mutual agreement on the policy for the payment of "Interest" under the Act.

SUMMARY: *The GSA prepayment audit contractors are guided by the Prompt Payment instructions for the agency or service that has hired them. The only Prompt Payment interest issue that has been sent to GSA Audits, we have advised the claimant to file with the GS Board of Contract Appeals.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *18 September 2002. Dennis Richey will brief on this item at the Symposium.*

ITEM: 254

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services and Operations Team

SUBJECT: U.S. Customs Documentation - Enhanced Compliance

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: U.S. Customs Officials are increasing their diligence to insure compliance with documents for FIREARMS and MOTORCYCLES.

Firearms: If the 1252 states that the shipment contains firearms, the carrier or clearing agent must submit a completed 1252-1 (all sections especially the code section 13a) and an ATF F6-Part II (all sections must be complete). A big part of the problem is that the forms are not completed properly by the service member and/or TO and therefore holds up the clearance of entire container.

Motorcycles: If the 1252 state that the shipment contains a motorcycle, a completed EPA Form 3520-1 and a HS7 (the Declaration) must be submitted. When Customs challenges the HS-7, the carrier or clearing agent is requested to submit a 'letter of conformity' from the manufacturer of the motorcycle to verify that the motorcycle was manufactured in the USA and/or was manufactured to meet all U.S. EPA and DOT regulations/standards.

Should the motorcycle not conform and/or the letter of conformity cannot be provided; an AAPT (partial clearance) has to be filed by a Licensed Customs Broker and the motorcycle be placed into General Order Storage (G.O.). Only after this is accomplished can the rest of the freight in the container be released. The service member has the following options for the non-conforming motorcycle; 1-Customs will destroy the motorcycle, 2- pay to re-export the motorcycle anywhere but Canada or Mexico, 3-pay for a Bond to remove the item from G.O. and pay a certified repair facility to bring the motorcycle into compliance.

The Carriers should not be held liable for any expense or resultant time delays (missed RDDs) due to these problems. Also, it ultimately costs the service members in unanticipated expenses, as well as delayed delivery of his goods, not to mention the potential for increased loss and damage claims when the shipment has to access at the port of arrival to remove the motorcycle.

RECOMMENDATION: Advise/Train PPSO on the Customs Regulations. Require Transportation Officers to process the VIN numbers with US Authorities (EPA/DOT) before the purchase is made by the member and/or before the authorization is given to ship. Insure all documentation is complete.

Allow carriers to bill any charges associated with the lack of documents.

SUMMARY/RESPONSE: *MTMC/Military Services believe that the responsibility to ensure a motorcycle conforms to EPA/DOT standards belongs to the service member. The service member is also responsible for notifying the Transportation Office that the motorcycle is nonconforming and is responsible for making the appropriate arrangements upon entry into the US. MTMC will send a message on shipment of nonconforming motorcycles, similar to the message on shipment of nonconforming POVs. In regards to the incomplete customs documentations on firearms, the carrier should be reviewing these documents prior to movement of the shipment from origin. If the document is incomplete, the carrier should notify the Transportation Office. If the Transportation Office refuses to comply, the carrier should notify MTMC.*

STATUS/ESTIMATE CLOSURE DATE: *Closed 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 255

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: U.S. Air Force

SUBJECT: Air Force Regionalization Implementation

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: The Department of the Air Force has begun the Regionalization process at the JPPSO-SAT and JPPSO-COS. Industry would like a briefing/update/discussion on lessons learned to date from both AF and Industry. Of primary interest would be the use of zones at JPPSO-COS and JPPSO-SAT and the timelines for future expansion. Of overriding concern is how will this program fit in with the MTMC Future Personal Property Program?

RECOMMENDATION: The Air Force should provide an update on this program. In addition, all parties should discuss any lessons learned that could be applied as the regions continue to expand. How can industry provide suggestions on structuring the zones at these locations?

SUMMARY/RESPONSE: *The Air Force will provide information to the ANSA December 2002.*

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: *CLOSED 18 September 2002*

ITEM: 256

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Air Force Claims Services

SUBJECT: Air Force - Claim Set-Off Appeals

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: First, Industry would request that the Air Force advise on the status of its efforts to catch-up on the backlog responding to claim 'set-off appeals.'

Currently, reports would indicate that it is taking an average of nine months to a year to receive a response. The second area of concern is when the Air Force will respond to a carrier set-off appeal, there may be mutual agreement on everything but one item, and the carrier will write back to point out an error, request documentation or provide information in support of its position; however, the Air Force appears to be treating the carrier's follow-up response as a totally new appeal; requiring the carrier to wait another nine months+ for a response on a claim appeal that is already open.

RECOMMENDATION: Effort should be increased to reduce the Appeal backlog. The practice of treating OPEN appeals, rebuttals or requests for additional information as NEW appeals should be corrected.

RESPONSE/SUMMARY: *Currently, first responses are running about ten months from date of receipt. Second refund responses that have a prior refund response are normally handled within a couple of months of receipt.*

ESTIMATE CLOSURE: *CLOSED 18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 257

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claim Services

SUBJECT: Depreciation on Claims - "Expensive Wood"

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: An issue that has been raised before is the interpretation of "Solid Wood (Expensive)" in the JMIDG.

The Air Force came out with specific guidance to their field offices, directing them to apply the 2 percent depreciation rate (instead of 7) to any furniture made of oak, cherry, walnut, mahogany, etc.

The confusion or inaccuracy enters the claims adjudication process when this 'elite' category of depreciation is applied to relatively inexpensive (cheap) furniture, instead of expensive furniture as it was intended.

RECOMMENDATION: Until such time that the Industry and the Claims Services can arrive at mutually acceptable and specific guidelines as to what qualifies as expensive woods and how and by who those determinations are reached, the Industry would recommend that proper guidance be resubmitted to the field.

This guidance should remind Claims Offices that the actual JMIDG does NOT include their verbiage about specific woods, and requires this lower rate of depreciation apply only to 'expensive' furniture.

RESPONSE/SUMMARY: *Expensive woods are solid hardwood such as "oak, cherry, walnut, teak, rosewood and mahogany.*

ESTIMATE CLOSURE: *18 September 2002.*

ITEM: 258

PROPONENT: Personal Property Division

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: On-Time Household Goods Performance

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: MTMC is conducting monthly analysis of on-time performance for both domestic and international shipments. Recent analysis indicates that on-time percentages are well below MTMC's intended goal of 99 percent. MTMC has noticed, in particular, a downward trend in on-time performance for shipments to/from the Central Command (CENTCOM), Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), and Southern Command (SOUTHCOM).

RECOMMENDATION: Discuss methods of improvement so that MTMC's goal may be attained.